

### **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claim 5 has been amended. Thus, claims 5-11 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants and their undersigned attorney wish to thank Examiner Stimpert for the helpful telephone conference of June 11, 2010 and the telephone voicemail left by the Examiner during the week of June 14, 2010. In the telephone conference, it was discussed that, as apparent from the "Response to Arguments" section in items 12-15 on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, the rejections presented in the May 24, 2010 Office Action were based upon a broad reading of the claim language with respect to the relative positions of the center of gravity of the balancing weight, and the eccentric section axis. Applicants' attorney proposed the amendatory claim language included in the attached amended claim 5. In the above-mentioned follow-up voicemail, the Examiner kindly indicated that, if filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), he expected that the amended claim 5 would either render the claim allowable or, if necessary, appropriate claim language could be worked out to render the application allowable.

With the claim language of claim 5 now very clearly defining relative locations of the center of gravity of the balancing weight and the eccentric section axis, the applied prior art clearly cannot be said to meet the claim language as presented.

In items 1-11 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 5, 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshima et al. (U.S. 5,816,783) in view of Fujikawa et al. (U.S. 4,628,876); claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshima et al. in view of Fujikawa et al. and Musso et al. (U.S. 6,695,973); and claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshima et al. in view of Fujikawa et al. and Hayashi et al. (U.S. 5,506,486).

Thus, it is submitted that in view of this amendatory claim language of claim 5, the broad reading previously applied to the claim language can no longer be applied, and the present independent claim 5, as well as claims 6-11 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Akihiko KUBOTA et al.

/Charles R Watts/

By 2010.08.03 12:37:44 -04'00'

Charles R. Watts

Registration No. 33,142

Attorney for Applicants

CRW/asd  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 3, 2010